

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-12 are pending in this application. Claims 6 and 9 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 7, 9, and 10-12 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-12 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10 and 11, as being indefinite. Claims 10 and 11 have been amended to clarify the subject matter being claimed. Applicants note that a time shifted peak response is described in the application on page 15, lines 4-20 and illustrated in Figure 4B.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 9 and 12 as being anticipated by Sakuragi.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 as amended recites, "a first current device configured to initiate a change in the state of the line, wherein the first current device includes a plurality of current devices connected in parallel." Sakuragi does not describe a current device including a plurality of current devices connected in parallel. Sakuragi describes a transistor output circuit comprising a first and a second transistor where the ratio of the gate width to the gate length of the first transistor is larger than that of the second transistor.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-6, and 8-12 as being anticipated by Do et al.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 as amended recites, "a switching device configured to limit the first current as the state of the line is changing." Do does not describe such a switching device. Do describes a control circuit with multiple stages. An inverter is connected between subsequent stages to provide a delay. Do describes a weak transistor connected at the output to minimize shoot up.

Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10, and 11 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above. In addition, note that claim 10 recites that "one of the plurality of current devices has a peak response that is time shifted with respect to one other of the plurality of current devices." This combination of elements is also believed to distinguish the cited art.

Claim 12 recites a method executed by the system of claim 1. Therefore, it is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/26/2004

Clover Huang  
Clover Huang  
Registration No. 55, 285  
V 408-973-2594  
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT AND YI, LLP  
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200  
Cupertino, CA 95014